DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 351 758 EA 024 445

TITLE	Developing School Leaders: A Call for Collaboration. A Special Report of the NASSP Consortium for the Performance-Based Preparation of Principals.
INSTITUTION	National Association of Secondary School Principals, Reston, Va.
PUB DATE	92
NOTE	54p.
AVAILABLE FROM	National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1904 Association Dr., Reston, VA 22091-1537.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)
EDRS PRICE	MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	*Administrator Education; Administrator Effectiveness; *Administrator Responsibility; Administrator Role; *Educational Administration; *Educational Cooperation; *Principals; Professional Development; Secondary Education

ABSTRACT

This report offers recommendations made by the National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP) University Consortium for improving the secondary principalship. Several premises require agreement within the profession: the definition of administrative competence and its assessment; the need for quality control; the role of state agencies and universities; and the balance among stakeholders for the delivery of content and skills. Chapter 1 examines issues in making administrator preparation more professional. The second chapter explores the career paths of four principals and identifies stages of administrator preparation and professional development. Chapter 3 examines considerations in guaranteeing quality in the areas of quality assurance and control. The fourth chapter presents the functions of each stakeholder and proposes five principles for a working model of principal preparation and development, which is based on the concept of "irreducible minimums"--those essential tasks for which each stakeholder is responsible. The final chapter suggests action steps based on collaboration and consensus to coordinate major stakeholders in the professional preparation of school administrators. The appendix includes a grid of principal preparation space derived from a preliminary survey and a list of 21 performance domains. (LMI)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ED351758

A Special Report

Developing School Leaders: A Call for Collaboration

NASSP Consortium for the
Performance-Based Preparation of Principals

National Association of Secondary School Principals
1904 Association Drive, Reston, Virginia 22091-1537

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN OTHER THAN PAPER COPY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
T.F. Koerner
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)"

EA024445

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

EA

Developing School Leaders:
A Call for Collaboration

A Special Report of the NASSP Consortium for the Performance-Based Preparation of Principals

National Association of
Secondary School Principals
1904 Association Dr.,
Reston, Va. 22091-1537
(703) 860-0200

NASSP University Consortium

Walter F. Beckman, professor and chair of school administration, California State University at Fullerton

Gordon A. Donaldson, Jr., professor of education, University of Maine, Orono

David A. Erlandson, professor and head of educational administration, Texas A & M University, College Station

Mel Heller, professor of administration and supervision, Loyola University, Chicago, Ill.

Edgar A. Kelley, professor emeritus of educational leadership, Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo

Lloyd E. McCleary, professor of educational administration, University of Utah, Salt Lake City

Leonard O. Pellicer, professor, college of education, University of South Carolina, Columbia

James W. Keefe, director of research, National Association of Secondary School Principals

Acknowledgments

NASSP and the University Consortium gratefully acknowledge the significant contributions of the following educators who reviewed the final draft of this report.

Alvis Bently, director of programs, Professional Development Division, Texas Education Agency, Austin

Robert E. Millward, professor of education and Assessment Center director, Indiana University of Pennsylvania, Indiana, Pa.

Robert St. Clair, executive director, Minnesota Association of Secondary School Principals, St. Paul

Scott D. Thomson, executive secretary, National Policy Board for Educational Administration, Fairfax, Va.

Jerry Valentine, professor of educational administration, University of Missouri-Columbia

Richard C. Wallace, Jr., superintendent of schools, Pittsburgh (Pa.) Public Schools

Copyright 1992
National Association of Secondary School Principals
1904 Association Dr., Reston, Va. 22091-1537 • (703) 860-0200
Timothy J. Dyer, *Executive Director*
James W. Keefe, *Director of Research*

Contents

	Foreword	v
1.	The Making of a Profession	1
2.	Pathways to School Leadership	4
3.	Guaranteeing Quality	15
4.	Seeking the Irreducible Minimums	21
5.	An Agenda for Action	30
	Appendix A: Preliminary Survey	35
	Appendix B: Performance Domains of the Principalship	38

Foreword

In 1985, the National Association of Secondary School Principals issued a special report of its University Consortium for the Performance-Based Preparation of Principals. That report challenged schools of education to move quickly to implement a series of recommendations for principal preservice program improvement. It stressed the importance of blending academic and performance-based components. The program model emphasized a gestalt of design, delivery, and evaluation. Systematic rating exercises were proposed to involve program graduates and faculty in the evaluation and modification of existing structures.

Many colleges and universities responded to the call for rethinking and redesign. Initiatives by the National Governors Association, the Southern Regional Education Board, and several states reflected the concerns of the Consortium and emphasized the key role of principals in school reform. The National Policy Board for Educational Administration, formed in 1987 by 7 (now 10) national education organizations including NASSP, has developed standards for the preparation and certification of school administrators.

The National Policy Board has identified 21 performance domains of the principalship, organized into four areas, that blend traditional content with leadership and process skills—to create a new framework for preparing principals. Knowledge, skills, and abilities are currently being defined. What remains is the need for consensus on dissemination and delivery. That imperative is the focus of this special report.

National Policy Board Executive Secretary Scott Thomson articulates the need in this way:

> To benefit the profession of school administration we now need structures for a genuine dialogue, the establishment of new linkages that can lead to mutually compatible goals. Productive work can then commence on the pressing problems which surround education. Our immediate goal must be, however, to find the means to move the current situation off center, to refocus the images, gain trust, and move ahead together.[1]

The professional issue is preparation, and the political one is certification. Both are critical. The states are the key to consensus. State education agencies are the logical catalysts for this new consensus, working with all major stakeholders.

---

1. Scott D. Thomson, *Uncertain Images: Deans and School Administrators* (Reston, Va.: NASSP, 1988).

Several premises are addressed in this report that require agreement within the profession:

1. The *definition* of administrative competence and its assessment at the preservice, entry, and early career stages must be reaffirmed. This is now done only in a minimal fashion through the uncoordinated efforts of at least four agencies: universities, licensing agencies, school districts, and professional associations.
2. The field of educational administration is in need of *quality control.* This responsibility is now badly split between universities, licensing agencies (state departments), districts, and professional organizations. In law and medicine, the dominant force is the *profession;* graduate schools, licensing agencies, and employers accept its definition of what must be learned and how this is demonstrated.
3. *State agencies* are the most likely catalysts in a process to bring some measure of unity to the often fractious partners in the preparation and career training of educational administrators. *The National Policy Board for Educational Administration* is defining standards that may gain a measure of acceptance. Universities must take these standards seriously rather than use them only as minimal measures of quality control.
4. The *university's* role in administrator preparation is primarily in the intellectual domain, one of creating, transmitting, and interpreting knowledge. But education is an applied discipline and should center on the problems, issues, and institutions that exist in the field. Universities must intensify the screening of candidates based on acceptable definitions of competence and assess their progress according to those definitions rather than by piecemeal course-taking norms. Universities must also support career training by undertaking applied research with practitioners in the field.
5. Balance among *stakeholders* must be achieved for the delivery of content and skills. Imbalance in responsibility and function can lead to lack of balance in preparation and lower quality assurance in the professional outcomes. In most places, no single agency accepts responsibility for coordination; an uncontrolled free market exists. A collegial approach is needed.

The NASSP University Consortium has come to a strong and concise view about these premises. Only a collaborative effort that clearly defines the roles and responsibilities of the stakeholders, integrates

functions wherever feasible, and sets high but reasonable standards for preservice and inservice preparation will move the profession ahead. Both professional and political issues are at stake. Stakeholders must first reach professional consensus, and then reach out to other partners.

The Association of Teacher Educators in a recent report on *Restructuring the Education of Teachers* summarizes the emerging action agenda succinctly:

> Political networks are needed to provide the base for improved research and better professional development. Because partnerships are vital to the future strength of teacher education, the education professions must join with outside groups such as the business community, industry, parents, government agencies, mass media, and various social agencies in a coalition directed to improving schools by improving the competence of teachers. Also, because partnerships involve both organizations and individuals, professional education associations, individual teacher educators, and other stakeholders in the effort must join together to advocate state and federal action and to work with governors and state legislators as well as national political leaders in government, the private sector, and agencies and foundations.[2]

The challenge of collaboration is before us. If we cannot be part of the solution, we will surely be part of the problem. We have an enormous opportunity to improve the development of school leaders. The NASSP University Consortium issues an unequivocal call to all stakeholders in professional preparation to work together for better communication, cooperation, and mutual action.

James W. Keefe
NASSP Director of Research

2. *Restructuring the Education of Teachers* (Reston, Va.: Association of Teacher Educators, 1991).

Chapter 1
The Making of a Profession

Deep discomfort exists about the relevance and adequacy of principal preservice preparation programs. Lack of quality is the main concern—focusing primarily on higher education institutions—in the knowledge base, clinical experiences, research, faculty, and students. Little attention has been given, perhaps with the exception of certification, to the role of other constituencies in preparation.

A brief but well-documented history of the efforts to improve the field of educational administration and the preparation of principals is contained in the introduction to the special report, *Performance-Based Preparation of Principals*.[3] This report is only one of a progression of efforts that began in the early 1950s to address the needs of preparation, and that closely parallels efforts in other fields such as business management, law, and public administration.

For example, the field of business management recognizes the misalignment of its preparation programs with the external environment. After a review of two 1959 reports calling for reform of preparation programs, a 1990 Commission on Graduate Management Education states that, "The problems and challenges of business education today almost certainly require a different set of responses; many of them originate outside the institutional context of the business school—indeed, outside the world of education itself." (Leadership for a Changing World, p.3.)

Preparation programs in educational administration have been locked into modes of thinking and structures of practice that have been overtaken by changes in the environment. There is a growing consensus, as in the 1950s, that fundamental changes must now occur. The many projects of NASSP, including those of this Consortium, and those of the University Council for Educational Administration, the American Association of School Administrators, interest groups of the American Educational Research Association, and other agencies, offer evidence that the foundations of change are well advanced. In addition, the National Policy Board for Educational Administration has established a unified direction for change. What remains to be done is the alignment of agencies and organizations upon which preparation depends.

3. *Performance-Based Preparation of Principals* (Reston, Va.: National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1985).

Overlapping Stakeholders: The Need for Collaboration

Preparation programs are influenced by various stakeholders that comprise formal and informal overlapping groups. Each has responsibilities for and perspectives on the nature of preparation. Each has means for providing it. The primary *university* stakeholders are the academicians with specialized fields and clinical practice, cooperating practitioners, and former students. Outside this inner circle are academicians in related fields and the central administrations of the colleges and universities.

Beyond the university, four other agencies and organizations have vested interests: *State agencies* accredit programs and license practitioners; *school districts* employ the graduates of the programs; *professional associations* provide a variety of services including training; and a grouping of *other agencies* such as assessment centers, principal academies, LEAD Centers, and unions attempt to raise the quality of administrative leadership.

Each of these five formal stakeholders, and various less formal ones as well, have legitimate interests in any given preparation program. Just as the reform of public education must occur school by school, so preparation programs must be reconstituted program by program. Conceptual and structural maps are needed to guide the process. Managing the environment is even more important. Too much institutional independence and balanced competition have been primary causes of the inertia that besets educational administration. Collaborative action is needed to minimize conflict and confusion.

The Rationale

The deliberations of the Consortium have convinced us that past efforts at improvement have been too "inward looking." Current initiatives have taken a definite "outward look." These have focused on: integration of clinical experiences with coursework, emphasis on leadership versus technical management, realistic problem solving through actual cases and simulations, reorientation of research to practical problems encountered in the field, systems of cohort teaching and tutoring, etc. Unfortunately, these improvements are still locked into the critical constraints established by the five formal entities that exercise immediate influence and control over programs.

The Consortium began this inquiry by identifying the "irreducible minimums" of preparation—those basic and essential roles and

functions in the preparation process for which each of the major stakeholders assumes responsibility. These are the critical components that must be present for preparation to be a seamless path. We listed the contributions that each of the entities makes to total professional career preparation. Then we examined the concept of the "mapping of career space" to investigate the question: How can any qualified potential administrator have available the irreducible minimums of adequate preparation so that career-long competence can be maintained?

The Consortium then considered the concept of "quality guarantee"—the need for the profession to assume responsibility for individual preparation and support throughout the entire professional career, from recruitment to exit from practice. We identified the need for quality assurance as well as quality control. Quality assurance guarantees that the "irreducible minimums" are in place and functioning; quality control exercises supervision over individuals through mandated evaluation procedures.

Finally, the Consortium proposed "action steps" needed to properly implement a fully functioning, career-long preparation and support system. These steps constitute a conceptual structure for the making of a profession. At issue is the career-long professionalization of educational administration (rather than the current "want to be" stance). Such a structure would allow preparation programs to recognize their strengths and limitations. It would demand a total, coordinated approach by all major contributing agencies and organizations.

What the Consortium proposes in this report is not a prescription, but rather a road map for the professionalization of educational administration.

Chapter 2
Pathways to School Leadership

This chapter explores some of the paths that principals follow to the principalship, and those that they travel to other professional positions. It seeks to identify the places along these routes where principals find preparation and seek professional development. By examining these pathways, we will sketch a map that may be helpful to institutions and agencies that are seeking to have an impact on the preparation and professional development of principals.

We begin our exploration by looking at the careers of four principals who took different paths in their professional lives. Two of these fictional principals, Susan Sanchez and William Winter, represent points near the opposite poles of a continuum that roughly parallel the "cosmopolitan-local" distinction of Gouldner, or the "career bound-place bound" distinction of Carlson. Between these extremes are a large number of different patterns, most of which represent variations in the two basic examples.

One pattern, which is still too common, is demonstrated by the case of Norma Newton, a capable woman who left the principalship because of limited opportunity. Another is represented by Fred Fox, a student and teacher-oriented assistant principal, who chose to remain in that position so that he could continue to do what he enjoyed doing. (These scenarios are based on a Preliminary Survey on the "Mapping of Principal Preparation Space." See Appendix A for a schematic of the survey results.)

Susan Sanchez

Throughout her high school and collegiate careers, Susan Sanchez had been an honor student and active in student activities. When she graduated from high school, she had planned to be an engineer, but decided in her junior year that engineering would not provide her with sufficient opportunity to work with and help other people. Accordingly, she began work toward a secondary school teaching certificate, and upon graduation accepted a job teaching trigonometry and calculus at Arrowsmith High School.

Sanchez was a success as a high school mathematics teacher. While teaching, she also worked toward a master's degree in mathematics education at a nearby university. In her third year on the job, she was

named department chair, and pursued with her teachers a comprehensive redesign of the high school mathematics curriculum. However, at this time she began to feel limited as a mathematics teacher.

She reentered the local university to seek administrative certification, anticipating that one day she would like to become a principal. Unfortunately, she did not find these administration courses either intellectually challenging or very useful in preparing her for an administrative career. After four courses at this university, she decided to take the rest of her coursework at the state university (150 miles away) during the summers.

Upon receiving her principal's certification, Sanchez took a position as assistant principal at Benson High School, a medium-sized suburban high school. As assistant principal, she took on responsibilities as a grade-level principal, and soon proved to the principal and teachers with whom she worked that she was a competent and caring administrator.

She also became active in the state principal's association and spent her own money to attend the NASSP convention. She convinced the district to support her attendance at state and national workshops.

The superintendent confided in her that she had unlimited opportunities in the district. Both incumbent principals in the district's two high schools were fairly young men, however, who were doing better than adequate jobs. It appeared to Sanchez that the path to the position she really wanted, the high school principalship, was blocked. After two years, she resigned and returned to the state university full time to pursue the Ed.D. degree.

After receiving her doctorate, Sanchez was selected as the principal at Carson High School, one of the largest high schools in the state. Six years later, under her direction, Carson was nationally known for its innovative curriculum, its excellent academic program, and its exemplary base of parent and community support. Sanchez has made several presentations at national and state conventions, and is frequently asked to hold summer workshops or teach courses at universities in the state.

She has had numerous offers to become a university professor, and has been offered two superintendencies in middle-sized districts. But she feels fulfilled as a high school principal, and at this point has no intention of making a career move.

William Winter

As a student at Dalton High School, William Winter was a better than average scholar, a very popular young man, and a very good athlete.

This pattern continued when he went to a nearby university on a football scholarship. He lettered in both football and track in college, and was a B- student as a physical education major with a minor in history.

Upon receiving his baccalaureate degree, he returned to Dalton to teach U.S. history and to coach. Winter was popular with his students. His teams never advanced far in any state championship series, but they showed consistently winning records. He was a well-known personality in town, and was universally respected by school officials, parents, and fellow teachers.

After his tenth year at Dalton, coaching began to lose much of its excitement for Winter. Several of the administrators in the district, including the high school principal and the superintendent, suggested that he consider preparing himself for a position in administration, particularly since there would be a vacancy in one of the district's elementary schools in a few years. He began taking courses toward a master's degree and principal certification at the same nearby state university where he had received his baccalaureate degree. He completed these in time to be appointed the new principal at West Elementary School.

As principal at West Elementary, Winter was a hit with the children and their parents, and a strong supporter of his teachers. He worked hard to give teachers flexibility in their classrooms, and did everything he could to make professional growth options available to them. He encouraged them to go back to school and to attend workshops, provided opportunities for them to visit exemplary programs in nearby school districts, and arranged to bring speakers from the community into their classrooms. After four years at West Elementary school, the principalship at Dalton Junior High School opened, and he moved into that position.

Winter believed that the principalship at Dalton Junior High School was made for him. His continuing links with many groups in the community and his easy way with students, parents, and teachers made him an even greater success than he was as an elementary school principal. His years of working with outstanding elementary school teachers provided him with an understanding of the instructional process that generally enabled him to act as a role model for his teachers, particularly the younger ones.

For his own professional development, Winter depends primarily upon the cohesive, very helpful, but informal network that exists among the administrators in Dalton. He and the high school principal attend the state secondary school principals' convention in alternate years.

Norma Newton

Norma Newton grew up on a farm and was the valedictorian of a small rural high school in a midwestern state. As an undergraduate, she attended the state's land grant university, where she majored in home economics education. Shortly after graduation, she married. She and her husband moved to another state so that he could pursue a master's degree in architecture. While he was in graduate school, Newton worked as a high school home economics teacher.

When her husband completed his degree, they moved to a large metropolitan area in the same state, where he was employed by a major architectural firm. Newton took a job in a large suburban high school. Over the next eight years, she took two short leaves of absence to give birth to a son and a daughter.

She actively pursued her career in teaching. In spite of the restrictions placed on her by her new family, she became involved in numerous school activities, including sponsoring a major student organization and chairing the faculty advisory committee. She regularly attended workshops and conferences that were pertinent to high school instruction. She was universally admired and respected by her students, fellow teachers, and the school's administrators. In fact, the principal, who noted her organizational and leadership skills, suggested that she go into administration.

Over the next three years, Newton took coursework at a university in their metropolitan area toward a master's degree in educational administration and principal certification. A year later, when one of the assistant principals at her high school became the principal of another school in the same district, Newton, with the principal's strong support, moved into the vacated position.

As an assistant principal, she eagerly took on new activities. Over the next eight years, she emerged as perhaps the most effective administrator on the campus. During this time, she went back to the university to enrich her background in curriculum and instruction and to obtain her superintendent's certificate. She also took on new responsibilities as chair of several districtwide committees. Her reputation as a capable educator grew in both the school district and the community.

Newton's career goal, however, was to be a high school principal. When the principal retired four years later, he recommended her as his replacement. Unfortunately, the district awarded the position to a man who was the principal of one of the school's feeder junior high schools.

Newton accepted this disappointment well, and worked support-

ively and effectively with the new principal. During the next eight years, she was rejected for five other high school principalships in her own district and in neighboring suburban communities. She reluctantly accepted the fact that these suburban districts were not likely to break their tradition of never hiring a woman as a high school principal.

What particularly bothered her was that the men awarded the principalships generally had less training and experience than she had. When she discussed the matter with her superintendent, he was very supportive and appreciative of the job she had done, but let her know that her quest would almost certainly end in disappointment.

Not too long afterward, the superintendent called Newton into his office and offered her the position of Director of Secondary Education. Newton, although grateful, felt somewhat ambivalent about the offer. She asked for time to think it over and to discuss it with her husband. She very much wanted to be a high school principal, but she realized that now, in her late 40s, her dream would probably never come true. Her husband's business had flourished, and they were not likely to move from the metropolitan area. Two days later, she accepted the promotion.

Fred Fox

In high school, Fred Fox was both an excellent student and a popular one. He was active in student government, chaired the debate team, and had the lead male role in the senior play.

As an undergraduate at a regional university, he majored in English and received his teaching certificate. He received good grades and was active in campus activities. Upon graduation, Fox accepted a position as a high school English teacher in a mid-sized city about 90 miles from the city were he had grown up.

Fox loved teaching. He spent endless hours helping his students and serving as the school's drama coach. He was especially effective in establishing contact with parents, and willingly took on many small jobs that no one else seemed to want. He attended nearly every school dance and athletic event.

Two years after he started teaching, he began work toward a master's degree in guidance and counseling and pursued certification as a school counselor. Four years later, an additional guidance counselor was needed at his high school, and he moved into the position.

During the next eight years as a guidance counselor, Fox continued his helpful support of students and parents and extended his

warm supportive role to teachers and administrators as well. His constant buoyancy and willingness to take on any task for the good of the school was recognized by teachers, students, parents, and administrators.

He began working on an administrative certificate. When an assistant principalship opened at another high school in the district, the principal actively recruited Fox for the position. He was excited about the prospects of the new position, but was reluctant to leave his present school. When he finally decided to make the move and sadly said good-bye to his many friends, the school held a special assembly in his honor.

As an assistant principal, Fox found even greater opportunities to create and cultivate a supportive climate in the school organization. In the years that followed his appointment, Fox regularly sought professional development through university courses, state and national professional meetings, and other sources. The principal, who had recruited him, fully recognized his talents and gave him wide berth to exercise them. His impact on the school became legendary throughout the district.

Fox had been an assistant principal for 11 years when the principal announced his retirement. He was the principal's choice to succeed him, and the superintendent concurred. Fox was flattered, and agonized over the offer for nearly a week. He loved what he was doing and was afraid that, as principal, he could no longer be as close to students, teachers, and parents. As he evaluated himself, he knew that he enjoyed helping others more than directing them. Finally, he told the principal that he preferred to continue as an assistant principal.

The principal expressed his regret at Fox's decision but acknowledged that Fox probably knew himself best. Fox, for his part, was greatly relieved that the decision had been made, and began making plans to provide support for the new principal when he or she was hired.

Before his retirement, Fox served as an assistant principal under three more principals, one for only a year. In spite of the shifts in administration, the school continued to be recognized for its supportive atmosphere. Almost universally, Fox was given the credit.

The Pathways to the Principalship and Professional Development

These four scenarios illustrate some common routes followed by administrators who seek and attain positions of educational leadership at the school

level. These routes are documented from the careers of principals (see Appendix) and extensive survey data, including those reported in NASSP's 1965, 1966, 1978, 1981, and 1988 national studies of the principalship.[4]

In one sense, each of the four cases is unique. Each represents a mix of individual background and ability, community demands, familial constraints, and institutional requirements. Yet, all four have a number of things in common that suggest that the pattern of principal preparation and career development is, in broad terms at least, a fairly regular and predictable one.

Analyses of a large number of career paths and decisions disclose the following:

1. Nearly all principals have first been teachers, though only about 20 percent (according to the 1988 NASSP study) go directly to the principalship from the classroom. (Most certification codes require teaching experience of prospective administrators.)
2. Service as an assistant principal is the most common route to the principalship.
3. Although many principals advance primarily within one school district, a large number of principals and individuals aspiring to the principalship also look fairly regularly at positions in districts within reasonable geographic proximity, most typically within the same state.
4. Most principals complete their coursework for administrative certification at a university that is geographically convenient.
5. A small but growing number of principals seek the doctorate.
6. Many principals depend upon their local districts as the primary source of their professional development. About three-fourths of all principals are involved in the activities of state and national professional associations, though at different levels of involvement.
7. The career assistant principalship is becoming increasingly common, reflecting the need for diverse leadership roles in complex educational institutions.
8. Pathways for the advancement of women and minorities in many school districts are still restricted.

Implications for the Professional Development of Principals

It is clear from these four scenarios, and from others with which the

4. For more information on these longitudinal studies, contact the NASSP Research Department, 1904 Association Dr., Reston, Va. 22091-1537.

reader is familiar, that no single career path (nor even a few discrete paths) lead to the principalship. Rather, candidates move in a *career space* that is shaped by interactions with the various people, agencies, and opportunities in that space. This career space offers possibilities for universities, school districts, professional associations, and other groups to positively affect the professional development of principals.

The scenarios we have presented suggest numerous ways that stakeholders might have more positively affected the career paths of the four administrators and others like them. All four professionals could, by some standard at least, be considered successful.

But what about others, perhaps equally talented, who are not in the right place at the right time? No guarantee exists that a large, prestigious high school will be waiting for a Susan Sanchez when she completes her Ed.D. But such an administrator is too talented for the educational system to lose or relegate to a less demanding position. Conversely, many principals are probably in their positions because they happened to be the best of a number of average candidates at the critical time when a new principal was needed.

How much talent is lost because capable administrators are not in significant positions? How is our educational system impaired because less capable administrators are in these positions?

Clearly, it is to the benefit of both principals and the agencies that affect their professional lives to see that professional talent is efficiently nurtured and placed. We must consider some questions and some alternatives that are raised by the four scenarios.

Susan Sanchez was a talented, energetic woman who recognized early what kind of training she needed, and when shifts in employment were desirable. She was also rather fortunate that things worked out for her as well as they did. The institutions that successfully employed her were clear winners in the process.

Nevertheless, her career raises some questions: For instance, there is no evidence that her first two employers did anything out of the ordinary to keep her from leaving them (e.g., grooming her for significant administrative positions, staying in contact with her while she worked on her Ed.D.). No record exists in these scenarios, but it is likely that both Arrowsmith and Benson High Schools replaced her with individuals of less talent.

What about the local university that lost her as a student because its preparation program was irrelevant? More important, what about the negative impact of this university on those who have completed its preparation program?

Sanchez became active in the state principal's association as an assistant principal; to what extent did the association use her talents to affect other principals and enhance its own reputation? Did the state's certification program encourage or discourage talented persons like Sanchez?

The local school district played a more active role in recruiting and placing William Winter as a principal. He also had some very clear talents: excellent rapport with the community, strong support of teachers, a willingness to give teachers considerable autonomy. He apparently learned fairly efficiently on the job.

But one suspects, in reading Winter's story, that his university preparation had little effect on his job performance. His minimal involvement with his professional association suggests that this was not a major channel for his professional development. An informal network of local administrators can do much to foster professional growth and decrease professional loneliness, but one wonders if an apparently insular group, like the one at Dalton, can do much to provide a vision that will lead schools into the next century.

Winter was comfortable in his position as principal of Dalton Junior High School. Teachers, parents, students, the superintendent, and community members were satisfied with him. Was he the best possible principal for Dalton Junior High School? One suspects that his performance, in terms of opening opportunities for his students, was considerably less than optimum.

Does Dalton Junior High School and its student body deserve less of an instructional leader than Carson High School had in Susan Sanchez? Why did the local university that prepared William Winter provide a less rigorous, less relevant preparation program than the state university that awarded Susan Sanchez a doctorate?

Recently, much attention has been given to equalization of funding for all schools within the boundaries of a state. Is there any guarantee that talent will be equitably distributed when financial resources are? What can universities, professional associations, and principal centers do to encourage a more equitable distribution of talent and excellence?

Norma Newton never became a principal. She wanted to be a principal, and the evidence in the scenario suggests that she would have been an excellent one. Her direct supervisor recommended her for the position. But tradition is strong; long-standing prejudices prevented her from rising to the position.

Her promotion to the position of Director of Secondary Education

recognized her talent; in that position she had high school principals reporting to her. Nevertheless, the principalship is a pivotal position, one that places great demands on the incumbent, but one that also furnishes great rewards, particularly the feelings of efficacy from being directly involved in the educational success of young people. Should Newton have had that opportunity?

Why are talented women like Norma Newton, or minority candidates, systematically denied access to these positions because of tradition? Even more important, why does the educational system allow tradition and prejudice to systematically deprive it of access to important pools of critical talent?

In Newton's case, the clear onus of responsibility rested with the local district, but other agencies were not exempt from responsibility. What have professional associations done to provide mentors for women and minorities and to promote their candidacies generally? What can universities do to publicize the case for recruiting women and minorities to key administrative positions?

The answers to these questions and others like them relate to both equal opportunity and the efficient use of scarce human resources. All agencies involved in the preparation and professional development of administrators have a stake in their appropriate resolution.

Fred Fox didn't want to be a principal. His career goal was to support students and teachers, and he found it fulfilled by an application of his talents as an assistant principal. It is highly probable that education would have been no better served if he had "advanced" beyond that position. His contributions as principal might have matched those of the person he replaced, but it is unlikely that the person who replaced him as assistant principal would have had his impact.

The career advancement ladder in school administration is pyramidal. Not everyone can advance to the top positions; not everyone wants to advance. Universities, professional associations, and other agencies should not assume that all highly talented individuals should advance.

This is not an argument for keeping a talented assistant principal who wants to advance in place because he or she is doing an excellent job. Rather, it is a call for universities to prepare prospective administrators for a *range of positions,* not only the ones at the top. It is a call for school districts to structure their administrative positions so that more school leaders can achieve the comprehensive professional fulfillment that Fred Fox found. It is a charge to professional associations to give equal status and attention to the various administrative positions that

are included in their memberships.

These four scenarios, taken as a whole, illustrate that much more vigorous and positive involvement in the leadership career space is required of all the agencies that attempt to have an impact on educational careers. Regular interaction and coordination among these agencies is needed. As the next chapter describes, guaranteeing effective administrative performance is a responsibility of all these agencies. Developing professional talent and enabling it to flow smoothly into appropriate leadership positions demands a much more robust and positive career development system than the one we have had in the past.

Chapter 3
Guaranteeing Quality

The major premise of this Consortium report is that the quality of administrative performance depends on the coordinated efforts of responsible institutions and agencies to prepare and support school administrators at preservice, entry, and succeeding career stages.

Guaranteeing quality entails two considerations: First, the structures and the programs of preparation and support must be in place and functioning appropriately. Second, the performance of those who provide the programs and of those prepared and supported by the programs must be verified. The first of these considerations we refer to as quality assurance; the second, quality control.

Quality assurance, the subject of *Performance-Based Preparation of Principals*, and again the focus of this chapter, can best be addressed by two questions.

1. How can the profession guarantee that those who choose, and are selected, to serve as educational administrators have the potential to meet acceptable criteria of competence, are adequately prepared, and are inducted into the profession ready to perform?
2. How can the profession guarantee that those in service have the opportunities to sustain levels of performance that meet high criteria of competence?

Administrative Competence and Responsibility for Ensuring Competence

In *Performance-Based Preparation of Principals*, competence was defined as follows:

> Competence can be measured only through an accumulation of evidence, over time, that an individual is able to apply knowledge and perform certain functions and skills in ways which are perceived positively by both the individual and his/her audiences. This conceptualization emphasizes reliability (an accumulation of evidence), validity (apply knowledge and perform skills), and legitimacy (in ways which are perceived as being positive).[5]

This definition became the basis for advocating a substantial increase in the field-based component of preparation programs. It

5. *Performance-Based Preparation*, p. 4.

emphasized the contextual nature of competence in that the individual and his or her audiences must develop criteria that have legitimacy in the setting in which performance takes place. It also recognized the need to satisfy concerns for reliability and validity.

Performance-Based Preparation discussed quality assurance and the means to assess preparation programs in terms of the following program components:

- Generic knowledge and skills required of school administrators
- Substantive content that is basic to discrete areas of administrative expertise
- Role-specific behaviors to be demonstrated in clinical settings
- Procedures for monitoring attainment of generic knowledge and skills, substantive knowledge, role-specific behaviors, and follow-up of candidates in on-the-job settings.

This effort was a major contribution toward guaranteeing quality in preservice programs. It provided for the necessary linkages between knowledge and practice. It did not give attention, however, to the full range of professional responsibility to develop and sustain administrative competence to a high level.

Earlier chapters of this document stress that five categories of stakeholders share an interest in the professional competence of school administrators:

1. The higher education institutions that provide preparation and services to school administrators
2. State agencies and governmental units that license administrators and establish policies and regulations relative to administrative performance
3. Local and intermediate districts that employ school administrators
4. Professional organizations at state and national levels that represent the interests and offer professional development opportunities to school administrators
5. Other agencies such as centers, academies, unions, etc. that provide advice, training, and other services to school leaders.

Still other organizations and agencies—governmental, professional, and private—have an interest as well, but these exercise influence largely through one or more of the five stakeholders above.

Activities and influences deriving from these five stakeholders

have been uncoordinated, competitive, and even contentious. Rather than functioning symbiotically, the agencies have tended to pursue their own policies and programs. The Consortium, in its deliberations, thinks of these agencies as "The Fractious Five," since administrator professional development and support is fractured rather than unified by their uncoordinated activity.

Points of Departure in Guaranteeing Quality

The first priority in guaranteeing functional quality must be the analysis of current school leadership needs, with clear definitions of program and delivery system requirements. The National Policy Board performance domains of the principalship do just that (see Appendix B).

The next priority must be to identify the complementary roles and responsibilities of the five primary stakeholders. Identification can be achieved by efforts such as this one, represented by the analyses and proposals of the Consortium.

A third priority must be the creation of a structure and the linkages by which these organizations and agencies can cooperate effectively. For a variety of reasons, it is at the state level that this coordination can be achieved most effectively, through cooperative arrangements and projects among the stakeholders.

To achieve the second priority, the Consortium proposes preparation mapping and the establishment of irreducible minimums, the critical components of preparation. These are the essential steps in quality assurance for career-long preparation and support of school administrators.

The Consortium proposes that preparation mapping be undertaken at the state level in order to:

- Draw up an inventory of institutions and agencies that have a role in professional preparation
- Identify their primary and secondary roles in preparation
- Permit an analysis of both duplications and gaps (needs).

To support this activity, the Consortium suggests that stakeholders agree to a set of irreducible minimums in professional preparation and inservice development that can serve as the basis for program articulation. A seamless path should be the goal.

At the national level, the National Policy Board for Educational

Administration unites professional organizations in the consideration of standards for preparation, certification, and ongoing assessment of principal performance needs.[6] The National Policy Board has identified 21 performance domains in four categories:

1. *Functional leadership domains* to address the organizational processes and techniques by which the mission of the school is achieved
2. *Programmatic domains* to cover the scope and framework of the educational program, the core technology of instruction, and related supporting services, developmental activities, and resource base
3. *Interpersonal domains* to consider the human relationships required to achieve personal and professional goals and organizational purposes
4. *Contextual domains* to treat the intellectual, ethical, cultural, and other influences upon schools, both traditional and emerging.

The work of the National Policy Board for Educational Administration provides a unifying base for the practical steps, recommended below, against which state level actions can be measured. (See Appendix B for a full listing of the 21 domains.)

Guaranteeing Quality: A Professional Responsibility

The Consortium contends that responsibility for guaranteeing quality rests with the profession. Integrity and commitment are the profession's highest values and its greatest strengths. Responsibility to the broader society and dependence on the broader society for moral and material support requires that the profession demonstrate the capacity to fulfill the functions associated with both quality assurance and quality control of administrative performance.

In guaranteeing quality, the profession must establish a coordinated system of preparation through all the career stages:

- Recruitment and preservice preparation
- Certification and induction to service
- Initial and early career administrative practice

6. See *Principals for Our Changing Schools: Preparation and Certification*, The National Commission for the Principalship, 1990, pp. 21-25. The Commission work anticipated the formation of the National Policy Board, but is now incorporated under the aegis of the Board.

- Mid-career and established professional practice
- Late career and exit from practice.

In each of these stages, both formative and summative evaluation must take place in order to recognize individual strengths and weaknesses. Administrator knowledge, skills, and attitudes must be measured in terms of criteria defined by the context within which leadership is actually exercised, and according to current standards of best practice as defined by the profession at large.

But performance evaluation addresses only quality control. What is still lacking is a coordinated structure of preparation and support for each school administrator throughout the five career stages. Once a preparation and support structure is in place, steps can be taken to guarantee the quality control side of the quality equation.

Guaranteeing Quality: Steps To Be Taken

In light of the previous discussion, the Consortium proposes the following steps for guaranteeing quality in administrative performance:

- The five major stakeholders must collaborate to identify the roles and responsibilities of each institution and agency, and to create productive linkages among them.
- These stakeholders *in each state* must map the preparation needed by school administrators at each career stage. Agreement must be reached among stakeholders about their reducible minimums to be provided through programs and activities, and structures must be created for cooperative planning. Questions must be raised about program approval, certification, and recertification.
- The stakeholders in each state must clarify and agree to their roles and their responsibilities for providing the irreducible minimums in programs and services. State education agencies should act as conveners, with attention to national standards; performance-based preservice and career-long inservice development; and certification based on measures of competence, individual assessment, and program evaluation.
- The profession must assume a stronger role in developing programs, services, and assessment procedures if it is to exercise a measure of control over the quality of administrative practice. It

can achieve this if stakeholders act collaboratively to determine roles and responsibilities, enter into cooperative activities to assess needs and priorities, and engage in genuine planning of preparation and support.

- School districts must evaluate the performance of their administrators using profession-wide standards interpreted in terms of situation-specific criteria.

- All stakeholders must agree to periodically aggregate individual assessment data and employ them as one means of evaluating the adequacy of the preparation and support services for which they are responsible.

Guaranteeing a level of quality in administrative performance that can stand rigorous scrutiny will not be an easy task. The responsibility for the assurance of quality rests with the institutions and agencies identified as the primary stakeholders here. Either these agencies must take the initiative to provide defensible guarantees of quality, or it may be imposed by authority external to the profession.

Much of the current concern for quality has centered on personnel evaluation, which addresses only the quality control issue. (Quality control deals with personnel performance.) Little attention has been given to quality assurance. (Quality assurance is concerned primarily with program validity.) The Consortium believes that the latter may well be even more important to the long-term quality of professional preparation and support.

Chapter 4
Seeking the Irreducible Minimums

The major stakeholders in principal preparation must develop a common model to drive their approach to preservice preparation and continuing growth. In this chapter, we present the current functions of each stakeholder and propose five basic principles for a working model of principal preparation and development.

These functions and principles constitute the basis for what we call irreducible minimums—those basic and essential tasks and/or roles of preparation for which each major stakeholder is responsible. Some overlap in the listing is obvious, but whether discrete or overlapping, establishing the interrelationships and interdependence among these minimum functions is crucial to the successful preparation and development of principals.

The Stakeholders

1. *Universities still carry the primary responsibility for preservice preparation.*
   - ➤ Provide a knowledge base (usually through courses).
   - ➤ Teach skills (simulation and/or clinical experiences).
   - ➤ Identify and recruit talent (marketing; career development).
   - ➤ Facilitate placement (endorsements and recommendations).
   - ➤ Provide technical service (resources/consultants to school districts, staff development/inservice, collaborative research/traditional research, development and dissemination, cooperative training, technology applications, etc.).
   - ➤ Influence legislation and policy preparation.

Beyond what the aspiring principal has learned as a teacher, the university is the first and usually the most influential contact in administrator preparation. What is taught, how it is taught, and by whom it is taught can shape administrative preparation significantly.

The coursework must be relevant to the job needs of a principal, so professors must be current, knowledgeable, and appropriate role models. The professor is a major link between the theoretical and the practical; between the knowledge and research components in administration (the discipline) and the application to the field (practice). This

blend is especially important in building clinical experiences such as the administrative internship, a learning experience that was found to be of the highest value for aspiring principals in recent NASSP University Consortium studies in Texas, Michigan, and New York.[7]

In addition to the functions listed above, the university must be able to identify graduate students who are likely to succeed in administration. Enrollment declines can tempt faculties to lower admission standards for graduate programs. Professors of administration must remain appropriately selective in their recommendations.

2. *School districts have assumed increasing responsibility for development.*

- ➤ Identify and recruit talent ("career management").
- ➤ Define expectations for candidates.
- ➤ Supervise internship experiences.
- ➤ Provide transition to practice.
- ➤ Offer resources for personal growth and development.
- ➤ Provide career mentoring for professional development.

Local school districts have undertaken significant roles in the preparation of principals. Local districts must identify and define expectations for potential administrators, provide professional development for administrators new to the district, and determine the working relationships between staff members and administrators.

In every instance, the local district establishes the organizational culture in which the principal works. This culture may be influenced by principals who are new to the district, but tradition is powerful. Examples proliferate of administrators who are successful in one situation and unsuccessful in another.

The local district, in meeting its minimum responsibilities, must view itself as the crucible in which the talent, the ambition, and the educational experience of the new principal are tested. The influence of the local district on principal functioning demands that each district implement a systematic plan of personal and professional development for all school leaders.

"Designer programs" are beginning to emerge. The Fairbanks

7. See *The Principalship in the 1990's and Beyond: Current Research on Performance-Based Preparation and Professional Development*, Laurie Witters-Churchill and David A. Erlandson, editors (UCEA Monograph Series, The University Council for Educational Administration, Tempe, Ariz., 1990).

(Alaska) School District, for example, contracts with professors and others to teach the framework designed by the district. Arlington County (Va.) is in the process of designing a program for in-house candidates to be delivered by a local university. Both districts use experienced principals as mentors in their programs.

3. *State departments of education have a pivotal and increasingly important role.*

   - Set standards for certification.
   - Set standards for preparation programs.
   - Administer assessment or certification examinations.
   - Provide preservice training.
   - Provide staff development.
   - Influence policy development on preparation.
   - Provide technical service (see the university descriptors).
   - Disseminate appropriate data bases (current data, archival data).

State departments of education are the official regulatory agencies in each state. The list of minimums for each state department emphasizes the legal obligation and responsibility of the state to establish and to enforce quality standards for schools. In this sense, the state department establishes part of the job description of a principal.

In fact, states set minimum legal expectations that principals must meet. The functions that are emphasized in any given state can (and do) have a major impact on reform initiatives as well as on job eligibility for the principalship. In its regulatory role, the state department can set certification requirements for the principalship as well as standards for maintaining certification. The latter function must be exercised with an eye to the universities, where coursework and clinical experiences will be provided.

Each state must review its formula for authorizing preservice preparation programs. Most states now base authorization on clock hours and courses taken. *Validated skills must become the focus.* Programs should emphasize the application of learned skills.

The current reform movement has created service centers under state auspices, labeled differently in different states, which are responsible for much administrator continuing development. The balance

between the functions of the university and these service centers must be monitored and arbitrated by state departments.

There have not been close links between universities and state departments in providing this balance. In some states, geography and manpower are problems for the state department, but sufficient oversight must be provided to ensure that the irreducible minimums of preparation are sustained.

Another major concern that must be overcome is the perception by many practitioners that state departments are havens for bureaucrats and managers (not leaders). The fact is that state law is the legal source of school districts, and its mandates and roles cannot be ignored. Much must be done to improve state and local school district relationships to ensure that the minimums of development are implemented systematically.

4. *Professional associations (national and state) provide the impetus for the improvement of preparation and development.*

   - ➤ Engage in research and development.
   - ➤ Design phases of preparation programs.
   - ➤ Serve members (information, training, assessment).
   - ➤ Offer career advisement and placement.
   - ➤ Provide networking and brokering.
   - ➤ Influence policy development on preparation.
   - ➤ Afford moral support for members.
   - ➤ Provide legal support for members.

The visibility and the existing communication networks of professional associations make their role very important. Professional associations monitor trends, research, and other pertinent issues affecting the principalship. They influence local, state, and national policy relative to the principalship through their contacts, research, and expertise. They clarify issues, provide advice to legislators as well as to their members, and offer valuable staff development programs for administrators. Their publications help members to be well informed.

The efforts of associations are already commendable, but they must exercise even greater leadership in professional development. Above all else, they should encourage principals to take an active part in designing their own professional development programs, and to

take charge of their own growth. The associations must become the major force to make the principalship a true profession.

A strong argument can be made that professional societies should be partners with universities and school districts in program design. The Massachusetts Elementary School Principals Association, for example, already has its own state-approved licensure program.

5. *Other stakeholders (principal/LEAD centers, intermediate units, governor's offices, unions) offer a variety of services.*

   - Identify and recruit talent for school administration.
   - Provide leadership training.
   - Offer networking opportunities.
   - Provide information services.
   - Influence policy development on preparation.

The variety and diversity of these agencies can make them helpful partners in the preparation of principals. They offer unique, specialized services as well as provide supplementary support to other stakeholders. The key for these agencies is cooperation without losing identity.

Principals in every state are exposed to an array of principals' academies, LEAD centers, and professional development opportunities derived from federal or state grants or provided by private consultants on leadership. These opportunities for growth and networking are commendable, but they do increase the potential that school administrators will be faced with difficult choices. The professional associations can and should assist principals in evaluating these program alternatives.

Unions (both administrative and teacher) can exert strong influence on the selection of principals, as well as the degree of cooperation with principals. Some unions focus on welfare and other benefits for their members, but the potential for a union to function as a professional association is great. When unions do function in the latter manner, they can have a powerful impact on the principalship. With the ever-increasing emphasis on participatory management, unions can affect policy and other major decisions significantly at the local and district levels. Union leaders, in particular, must work effectively with other stakeholders beyond "axe to grind" concerns. Collaboration must be, and can be, professional.

All these "other stakeholders" influence state departments and

national agencies on goals, governance, and other major policy matters. Their views and stances in the preparation, selection, and retention of principals cannot be ignored.

Figure 1 summarizes various stakeholder responsibilities as they currently exist.

Principles for Professional Development

The Consortium has identified five principles stemming from a consideration of these irreducible minimums to guide efforts in improving professional preparation, support, and development of school leaders. We believe that all stakeholders can and should direct their efforts toward these principles. If this should happen, stakeholders will more readily be able to guide both current and future generations of principals and enable them to gain the knowledge, skills, and attitudes necessary to lead the schools successfully in the new century. In the process, school administration will be strengthened as a profession.

Principle 1: Self-Determination

Principals must be the central actors in their own professional development; responsible participation in professional growth leads to professional self-determination.

As adult learners leading learning organizations, principals must model the best learning practices. They must identify their own growth goals and be partners with other stakeholders in shaping professional development activities to meet those goals. Principals must integrate their own learning with the needs of their schools, forming crucial bonds between ideas, skills, and actions in the workplace.

Principle 2: Collaboration for Quality

Stakeholders, including practitioners, must work collaboratively to identify the elements of quality and the standards and means for achieving quality in the development of school leaders.

The current development process suffers from fragmentation of effort and approach. Principals across the country are too often left alone to cope with improving their professional performance. All stakeholders—including principals—with responsibility for each phase of professional development must convene to remedy this condition. Together, they must marshall their often meager resources to form a system of stewardship to support school leaders professionally throughout the entire career span.

Figure 1. Current Stakeholder Responsibilities in Principal Professional Development

RESPONSIBILITIES	UNIVERSITIES	SCHOOL DISTRICTS	STATE DEPARTMENTS	PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATIONS	OTHER AGENCIES
KNOWLEDGE DEVELOPMENT					
Determine Knowledge Base	Primary		Secondary	Primary	Secondary
Identify Skills	Primary		Secondary	Primary	Secondary
Conduct Research & Development	Primary		Secondary	Secondary	Primary
Maintain Data Base on Principals		Secondary	Primary		
Provide Information Services			Secondary	Primary	Primary
Provide Technical Assistance	Secondary		Primary	Secondary	Primary
CAREER DEVELOPMENT					
Provide Preservice Education	Primary	Secondary	Secondary		Secondary
Identify & Recruit Leaders	Secondary	Primary		Primary	Secondary
Place Candidates	Primary	Secondary		Secondary	
Conduct Induction	Secondary	Primary			
Build Support Networks	Secondary	Primary		Primary	Primary
Offer Staff Development	Primary	Secondary	Primary	Primary	Secondary
Provide Career Guidance/Mentoring	Primary	Primary		Secondary	Secondary
POLICY DEVELOPMENT					
Set Preparation Program Standards	Secondary		Primary	Secondary	Secondary
Set Certification Standards	Secondary		Primary	Secondary	
Set Job Performance Standards		Primary		Secondary	
Influence Policy	Secondary		Primary	Primary	Secondary

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Principle 3: Knowledge Integrated with the Workplace

Stakeholders, including principals, must engage in continuous and joint inquiry to ensure that professional development meets the actual demands of the workplace and influences the actual performance of school leaders and their schools.

Knowledge is too often polarized into theoretical and practical, ideal and real. School leaders need ideas, skills, and attitudes that link ideals, research findings, and theoretical insight to school practices. This process requires joint and continuous inquiry into school improvement and the dynamics of leadership.

These activities will enable principals to reflect on practice with the rich array of new information and ideas that make development possible. School leaders must engage in reflection on practice, on personal and professional goals, on educational ideals, and (with other stakeholders) on the improvement of school performance.

Principle 4: Support Throughout the Career

Stakeholders must coordinate their professional development efforts to enable principals to receive timely support and develop knowledge and skills appropriate to the needs of the individual, his or her school, and the profession.

Preparation and development services are too frequently concentrated at the beginning of principals' careers or on topics and skills inappropriate to differing career stages. Professional development needs change with the principal's career stage, job, and school. Stakeholders, including principals, must adapt professional development opportunities to respond to the changing needs of principals and emerging demands of school leadership. Traditional roles and strengths of stakeholders must be reassessed and adjusted.

Principle 5: Economy of Effort

A more effective professional development system for the 1990s and beyond requires economy of effort and much greater collaborative implementation by stakeholders to ensure that the principal, the profession, and the entire educational enterprise are best served.

As the requirements of school leadership have changed, new professional knowledge and skills are needed to support school improvement. Stakeholders' interests and capabilities have changed as well. Current fragmentation among stakeholders hampers their ability to respond efficiently to principals' needs. After the roles and relationships among these agencies have been identified and clarified, more and different configurations of collaborative service must be shaped into a coordinated system supporting principals' professional development.

We began this inquiry into the "irreducible minimums" of principal preparation by identifying the contributions of each of the major stakeholders. We derived five principles of professional development from our consideration of the current minimums, and suggested some ways these principles might be applied. Our final objective is to propose an agenda for collaborative action that addresses real "career space" reform.

Chapter 5
An Agenda for Action

The purpose of this chapter is to suggest action steps to coordinate and unify the work of the major stakeholders in the professional preparation of school administrators. The *sine qua non* of this action is collaboration and consensus on the part of all stakeholders.

A Call for Collaboration

Our call for collaboration reflects the assumption that reconceptualized standards and programs will be the result of effective working relationships among stakeholders, and that change procedures must be directed toward the development of team relationships, not stakeholders or individuals acting in isolation. The commitment of stakeholders to a system of collaboration and consensus will promote confidence and trust, discernible growth, and the attainment of mutual goals. Jointly agreed-upon structures and relationships that support mutual trust among stakeholders must replace the existing uncontrolled free market structures.

Discrete structures undermine trust by encouraging stakeholders to compete. Collaboration and consensus encourage and reward commitment to one another and to mutual goals. Shared responsibility for collaborative goals also supports communication, experimentation, and innovation.

The strategies outlined in this chapter rely on collaboration and consensus for their validity and strength.

A Partnership Built on Collaboration

What can a partnership do that one stakeholder alone cannot do? A collaborative partnership can surely do more, and in less time. But quite apart from quantity and efficiency, two questions arise: First, can a collaborative partnership produce a better prepared principal? Second, can such a partnership better sustain professional development? The answer to both questions, our experience has shown, is an emphatic yes, provided stakeholders learn to work together toward common goals.

When experienced stakeholders get together on a high level of professional interchange, things begin to happen. New thoughts are generated; ideas flow. The excitement of creative interchange and interaction can

help solve complex problems and enhance the likelihood that better school leaders will emerge from the resulting programs of preparation. The partnership we have in mind would be an association of stakeholders who share common goals, who are willing to collaborate, and who can communicate with each other.

The character of such a partnership would be omnidirectional, not linear. It would require a high degree of interaction and cooperation; it would be a sharing of ideas, a giving and receiving of encouragement, a complement of stakeholder talent and experience; it would be well-defined, but creative and innovative. All stakeholders would learn to work together as a group, and depend upon each other.

The partnership would produce a unified direction in each state, greatly reducing the problems of fragmentation. A collaborative approach would involve stakeholders with a wide range of specialties, resulting in more efficacious planning and smoother progress toward the common goal: the creation of school leaders who consistently surpass those of the past. When stakeholders have the opportunity to pool ideas from the very beginning, their ideas are honed and resolved. When roles are fragmented, the result is usually a piecemeal reworking that, even after major surgery, constitutes an imperfect whole.

Steps for Collaborative Action

To encourage stakeholders to direct their efforts toward the five principles of professional preparation enunciated in Chapter 4, the Consortium recommends these action steps for each principle.

Principle 1: Self-Determination

1. Stakeholders should involve practitioners in planning and delivering systematic professional development activities.
2. Stakeholders should develop training models that allow principals to integrate their own learning with the needs of their schools.

Principle 2: Collaboration for Quality

3. All stakeholders should collaborate with university/college educators in the design, delivery, and assessment of preservice preparation programs.
4. Stakeholders should develop collaborative regulations and policies at the state level that promote innovation and change in university and other preservice preparation programs.

5. Stakeholder action plans should ensure that preservice preparation is clinically oriented, research and performance-based, and adequately supported.

Principle 3: Knowledge Integrated with the Workplace

6. Stakeholder action plans should enable universities to critique and improve their principal preparation programs in terms of practitioner needs and recommendations.

7. Stakeholders should work collaboratively to secure resources to fund clinical experiences, internships, and other field-based experiences.

Principle 4. Support Throughout the Career

8. Stakeholder action plans should include continuing personal and professional support for principals, and rigorous assessment, especially in the early career years.

9. Stakeholders should identify and train a cadre of experienced administrators to work as mentors in the professional development of school leaders.

10. Stakeholder action plans should be flexible enough to respond to the changing needs of principals and the emerging demands of school leadership.

Principle 5: Economy of Effort

11. Stakeholder partnerships should build coalitions with political and governmental organizations whose continuing support is essential for effective principal preparation and development.

12. Stakeholders should secure collaborative funding and other resources to provide principal preparation programs with necessary personnel, technology, and support services at all levels of collaboration.

13. Stakeholder action plans should foster research on educational leadership and administration and ensure that evaluation of principals and preparation programs are based on that research.

14. Stakeholder action plans should encourage the adoption of program approval policies at the state level that discourage low-quality or inadequate principal preparation programs.

An Agenda for Action

A recent conference in the state of Maine demonstrates what is possible when key stakeholders come together to examine school leadership and to explore new ways to improve that leadership.

A significant element of the conference was the group mix. Representatives from universities, school districts, the state department of education, professional associations, and other leadership agencies met as a stakeholder's group. Assembling such a complete group of stakeholders with a common purpose was, in itself, a significant action step.

The group agreed that the improvement of the principalship required a strong and clear statement of the need, and that the organizations must begin from this common understanding to work together. *The stakeholders agreed on the essential element of collaboration!*[8]

In a similar vein, the Association of California School Administrators (ACSA) is in the process of defining a new preparation program as convener and equal partner with the university community and the State Credentialling Commission. Tennessee's new licensure program also reflects major input from school administrators as well as from the more traditional stakeholders.

This special report has provided only a partial view of the essential stakeholder roles and responsibilities for career preparation and development of school leaders. In the spirit of partnership and in the light of this review, however, we would like to propose a collaborative *master agenda.*

- First, we recommend a wide dissemination of this publication among the various stakeholders. It is essential that all major stakeholders receive and review this report. Our expectation is that these ideas will be the impetus for action.
- Although states differ as to locus of control, state departments of education are probably the most logical agencies to assume the responsibility for bringing together the various other stakeholders. State departments could accomplish this through statewide or regional conferences to engage stakeholders in working collaboratively and building consensus.

8. See G. Donaldson, "Good Anchorage," in *Reflections 1992: If Not Now, When? If Not Us, Who?* (Cambridge, Mass.: International Network of Principals Centers, Harvard University, 1992.)

- With state departments of education acting as catalysts, the major stakeholders should cooperatively develop a state master plan for the preservice and inservice development of school administrators. This master plan could create a collaborative partnership that would clearly delineate the principles, roles, responsibilities, and quality guarantees for the stakeholders.
- Each of the major stakeholders should assume responsibility for the appropriate changes and strategies in the implementation of the master plan. The collaborative partnership would act as an advisory agency throughout the implementation phase of the plan.
- Finally, each of the stakeholders should be involved in evaluating the master plan. Coordinating this evaluation would most logically be the function of state departments of education.

Conclusion

It would be unrealistic to anticipate significant modifications in principal preparation and development programs without an accompanying major shift in the balance of roles and responsibilities of the major stakeholders. We have suggested ways to coordinate the roles, responsibilities, and relationships of these stakeholders in new deployment patterns.

We hope that in the near future the primary roles and responsibilities of the stakeholders will present a more recognizable, cooperative, and complementary pattern. We do not anticipate the elimination of any current stakeholders; we do anticipate the redefinition of their roles and responsibilities. In any event, the design and implementation of professional preparation and development for administrators must receive high priority.

No one can predict with certainty what will happen to principal preparation and professional development. This is a vision of what could be. Perhaps focusing on the need for new cooperation and consensus will be self-fulfilling. It will take more than talk, however, to generate the needed vision, programs, and strategies. Organizational life is enormously complex and major changes are not simple to effect.

Those of us with a stake in preparing school leaders must overcome our propensity to procrastinate. We must look for strategies to end our fragmented ways. The time has come to face the real challenges of preparation in a constructive manner. The NASSP University Consortium calls upon all stakeholders to unite in a rational attack on the common problems associated with the identification, preparation, and development of school leaders.

Appendix A
Preliminary Survey of the Mapping of Principal Preparation Space
NASSP University Consortium for the Performance-Based Preparation of Principals
Preliminary Survey Responses Relating Stakeholders and Functions

	Decision To Enter Principalship	Preparation	Certification	Initial Placement in Principalship	Subsequent Placement(s) in Principalship	Professional Growth
Informal associations with other professionals (including colleagues & mentors)	A colleague encouraged me. Strongly encouraged by my supervisor. Informal associations created an interest. Talking to principals and professors. Colleagues and mentors encouraged me. A central office consultant encouraged me. Some influence. Great influence.	Colleagues assisted/encouraged me. Supervisor helped strengthen my tenacity. Helpful info. provided by other professionals. Practical ideas shared; encouragement. Made me aware of pitfalls to avoid as principal. Helped develop positive managerial attitude. Colleagues recommended courses to take/avoid. Interaction/networking.	Supervisor helped strengthen my tenacity. Mentors provided information. Recommendation & continued support. Asked colleagues about cert. requirements. Little or none.	Mentors assisted through this process. Very helpful. Colleagues gave me administrative responsibilities while I worked as a teacher. Association with practicing administrators was helpful.	Informal networks let administrators know about openings around the state. Having good references from former principals/other professionals. Worked with Teachers Corps. Former classmate in program at TAMU recruited me to work for him. Recommendations to central office from district/community personnel. None cited by majority.	Colleagues and mentors have provided leadership and info. for professional growth. Gave opportunity to get the experience. Idea exchange beneficial; chance to use ideas from other district. Made me aware of what college courses would be most beneficial to me as a principal. Internship, talking with and observing other principals. Monthly principals' meetings.
Universities	Has done an excellent job of building my self-esteem. Counseling/support by professors. Refined my desire. Awareness of duties/resp. of a principal. Reputation of school's program. Assessment center. Courses taken furthered motivation.	University was instrumental in decision to pursue Ed.D. Very little preparation on critical issues. Presentation of theories/practices addressed problems and current issues/trends. Provided solid academic base in admin./educ.. Cohort group meetings of most help. Key role.	Profs carefully guided course selection. Req. courses made me a better administrator. Total control. Support from professors primary reasons for completing certification. Degree/certification requirements.	Provided me with notice of job openings and/or placement services. Grades and recommendations from profs. Total control. Unaware of specifics.	Unaware of specifics. Provided recommendations. Internship. Supplied information about jobs. Some help. Great help. N/A	University has helped me grow with experience. Universities provided opportunities. Academic-graduation requirements. Has kept me abreast of changes in education. Provided course offerings & opportunity to teach graduate courses. Principals' Center affiliation most helpful. Great help. Some help.

NASSP University Consortium for the Performance-Based Preparation of Principals
Preliminary Survey Responses Relating Stakeholders and Functions

	Decision To Enter Principalship	Preparation	Certification	Initial Placement in Principalship	Subsequent Placement(s) in Principalship	Professional Growth
Local School Districts	Encouraged me to seek certif./degree. Personnel office recruiting and initial info. Enjoyed the districts I worked in as a teacher. Gave opportunity to be summer school principal. Openings available.	Internship/field work/admin. responsibility. Job preparation (Dean, Asst. Prin., Vice Prin.) My position as instr. specialist strengthened my base as an inst. leader. Learning all there is to know about a school district. Assisted through tuition refund programs.	District encouraged me to seek certification. Requirements necessary. Support and flexible schedule to assist me. Internship. Notifies principals through personnel department of recertification requirements and tracks progress. None cited by majority.	Appointed by superintendent. Appropriate networking. Placed me as assistant principal initially. I was trained by adm. for the position. Recom. from different schools & principals. Admin. position offers from local district. Recruited and offered good salary/merit pay. Helpful.	Encouraged me to apply. Provided recommendations to other districts. Placed me in new position. Appropriate networking. Recommendations. None cited by majority.	Provides staff devel. progs./conferences. District has many things. Dist. funds to travel to conferences/workshops. The number of years I taught prepared me. Very little. Mgmt. Acad./Ed. Serv. Center staff Development. Very helpful. Some help.
Intermediate Districts	None cited.	None cited.	None cited.	Notified me about job opportunities in their district. None cited by majority.	Hired me as a high school principal. Some. None cited by majority.	Great help. Some help. None cited by majority.
State Depts. of Education	None cited.	Information given to local school district. Approval of college coursework for certification. Some information. None cited by majority.	Establishes certification requirements. None cited by majority.	Required. None cited by majority.	None cited.	Only in TTAS training. Training as a TEA monitor. Has required prof. growth opportunities. Sponsors/conducts workshops, inservice, and state principals' conference. Some help.

NASSP University Consortium for the Performance-Based Preparation of Principals
Preliminary Survey Responses Relating Stakeholders and Functions

	Decision To Enter Principalship	Preparation	Certification	Initial Placement in Principalship	Subsequent Placement(s) in Principalship	Professional Growth
Professional Associations	Helpful information was available. Yes; literature helpful. ACSA helpful.	Inservice and conventions help me with different school situations. Availability of published materials. Drive-in conferences/annual state meetings. Little or none cited by majority.	ACSA lobbies. Changes and current issues provided through NASSP/TASSP *Bulletin*.	Made me aware of job opportunities in other districts. None cited by majority.	Provided announcements of job openings.	Literature provides constant updates on legislative/legal changes, meetings, etc. Provides opportunities to participate. Networking opportunities.
Principals' Centers	None cited.	Attended Institute for Beginning Administrators summer 1968 at TAMC. Information from Principal's Center has been great. None/Too new cited by majority.	Made me aware of necessary requirements. Has some influence.	School district took the lead in using the principals' center. The former director found the opening, which I was able to get. None cited by majority.	Possible networking in other districts. None yet, but I feel that my future placements will be due in part to my involvement with the TAMU Prin. Center. None cited by majority.	Valuable assistance in the area of job performance relative to managerial skills. Opportunity to gain new insights on issues. Principals' Center Sum. Acad. is excellent. Greatly assisted in prep. for first year. TAMU Prin. Center has been very helpful. Very helpful.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Appendix B
Performance Domains of the Principalship

National Commission for the Principalship
National Policy Board for Educational Administration (1990)

I. Functional Domains

These domains address the organizational processes and techniques by which the mission of the school is achieved. They provide for the educational program to be realized and allow the institution to function.

1. *Leadership:* Formulating goals with individuals or groups; initiating and maintaining direction with groups and guiding them to the accomplishment of tasks; setting priorities for one's school in the context of community and district priorities and student and staff needs; integrating own and others' ideas for task accomplishment; initiating and planning organizational change.

2. *Information Collection:* Gathering data, facts, and impressions from a variety of sources about students, parents, staff members, administrators, and community members; seeking knowledge about policies, rules, laws, precedents, or practices; managing the data flow; classifying and organizing information for use in decision making and monitoring.

3. *Problem Analysis:* Identifying the important elements of a problem situation by analyzing relevant information; framing problems; identifying possible causes; identifying additional needed information; framing and reframing possible solutions; exhibiting conceptual flexibility; assisting others to form reasoned opinions about problems and issues.

4. *Judgment:* Reaching logical conclusions and making high quality, timely decisions given the best available information.

5. *Organizational Oversight:* Planning and scheduling one's own and others' work so that resources are used appropriately, and short and long-term priorities and goals are met; monitoring projects to meet deadlines.

6. *Implementation:* Making things happen; putting programs and

plans into action; applying management technologies; applying methods of organizational change including collaborative processes; facilitating tasks; establishing progress checkpoints; considering alternative approaches; providing "mid-course" corrections when actual outcomes start to diverge from intended outcomes; adapting to new conditions.

7. *Delegation:* Assigning projects or tasks together with clear authority to accomplish them and responsibility for their timely and acceptable completion.

II. Programmatic Domains

These domains focus on the scope and framework of the educational program. They reflect the core technology of schools, instruction, and the related supporting services, developmental activities, and resource base.

8. *Instructional Program:* Envisioning and enabling instructional and auxiliary programs for the improvement of teaching and learning; recognizing the developmental needs of students; ensuring appropriate instructional methods; designing positive learning experiences; accommodating differences in cognition and achievement; mobilizing the participation of appropriate people or groups to develop these programs and to establish a positive learning environment.

9. *Curriculum Design:* Interpreting school district curricula; planning and implementing with staff members a framework for instruction; initiating needs analyses and monitoring social and technological developments as they affect curriculum; responding to international content levels; adjusting content as needs and conditions change.

10. *Student Guidance and Development:* Providing for student guidance, counseling, and auxiliary services; utilizing community organizations; responding to family needs; enlisting the participation of appropriate people and groups to design and conduct these programs and to connect schooling with plans for adult life; planning for a comprehensive program of student activities.

11. *Staff Development:* Identifying with participants the professional needs of individuals and groups; planning and organizing pro-

grams to improve staff effectiveness; supervising individuals and groups; engaging staff members and others to plan and participate in recruitment and development; initiating self-development.

12. *Measurement and Evaluation:* Determining what diagnostic information is needed about students, staff, and the school environment; examining the extent to which outcomes meet or exceed previously defined standards, goals, or priorities for individuals or groups; drawing inferences for program revisions; interpreting measurements or evaluations for others; relating programs to desired outcomes; developing equivalent measures of competence.

13. *Resource Allocation:* Planning and developing the budget with appropriate staff members; seeking, allocating, and adjusting fiscal, human, and material resources; utilizing the physical plant; monitoring resource use and reporting results.

III. Interpersonal Domains

These domains recognize the significance of interpersonal connections in schools. They acknowledge the critical value of human relationships to the satisfaction of personal and professional goals, and to the achievement of organizational purpose.

14. *Motivating Others:* Building commitment to a course of action; creating and channeling the energy of self and others; planning and encouraging participation; supporting innovation; recognizing and rewarding effective performance; providing coaching, guidance, or correction for performance that needs improvement; serving as a role model.

15. *Sensitivity:* Perceiving the needs and concerns of others; dealing with others tactfully; working with others in emotionally stressful situations or in conflict; managing conflict; obtaining feedback; recognizing multicultural sensibilities.

16. *Oral Expression:* Making oral presentations that are clear and easy to understand; clarifying and restating questions; responding, reviewing, and summarizing for groups; utilizing appropriate communicative aids; adapting for audiences.

17. *Written Expression:* Expressing ideas clearly in writing; writing appropriately for different audiences such as students, teachers, and parents; preparing brief memoranda.

IV. Contextual Domains

These domains reflect the world of ideas and forces within which the school operates. They explore the intellectual, ethical, cultural, economic, political, and governmental influences upon schools, including traditional and emerging perspectives.

18. *Philosophical and Cultural Values:* Acting with a reasoned understanding of the role of education in a democratic society and in accord with accepted ethical standards; recognizing philosophical and historical influences in education; reflecting an understanding of American culture, including current social and economic issues related to education; recognizing global influences on students and society.

19. *Legal and Regulatory Applications:* Acting in accordance with relevant laws, rules, and policies; recognizing governmental influences on education; working within local rules, procedures, and directives; administering contracts.

20. *Policy and Political Influences:* Identifying relationships between public policy and education; recognizing policy issues; examining and affecting policies individually and through professional and public groups; relating policy initiatives to the welfare of students; addressing ethical issues.

21. *Public and Media Relationships:* Developing common perceptions about school issues; interacting with parents and community opinion leaders; understanding and responding skillfully to the electronic and printed news media; initiating and reporting news through appropriate channels; enlisting public participation; recognizing and providing for market segments.

1900 Association Drive
Reston, Virginia 22091-1537

BEST COPY AVAILABLE